ALTERED STATES: A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON CENSORSHIP IN THE NIETZSCHE ARCHIVE
BY MAX MARMOR

The Yale Library owns two noteworthy copies of an important biographical study of the German philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900). Carl Albrecht Bernoulli’s Franz Overbeck und Friedrich Nietzsche: Eine Freundschaft was published in two large octavo volumes in Jena, Germany, in 1908, by the distinguished firm of Eugen Diederichs (fig. 1). As the title suggests, Bernoulli’s study is devoted to Nietzsche’s abiding friendship with Bernoulli’s mentor Franz Overbeck (1837–1905), the noted scholar of the New Testament and the early Church, who played a singular role in Nietzsche’s life and literary afterlife. Bernoulli’s book is not only an essential documentary source for the study of Nietzsche’s life; it is equally interesting from a bibliographical standpoint, the second volume having been heavily censored prior to publication. The copies at Yale—in the Beinecke Library and at Sterling Memorial Library—exemplify the variant forms this censorship assumed at different stages in the press run.

Few philosophers since Plato have written as much or as eloquently about friendship as Nietzsche; few have been as friendless. Despite his virtual apotheosis of “the friend,” which culminated in Also Sprach Zarathustra, Nietzsche’s temperament proved ill-suited to lasting bonds. His two courtships of his intellectual and artistic peers, composer Richard Wagner (1813–83) and historian Jacob Burckhardt (1818–77), perished, respectively, in fire and ice. Nietzsche’s passion for intellectual independence and his disdain for the Reich and all it stood for proved intolerable to the imperious and anti-Semitic composer, while his passionate engagement with the life of the mind threatened the cultivated reserve of the great historian, who regarded his younger colleague at the University of Basel from a cool if benign distance.

It was different with Franz Overbeck. One of Nietzsche’s more perceptive biographers, R. J. Hollingdale, writes that Overbeck was “the one permanent friend Nietzsche had whose friendship was founded on a purely personal, instinctive base.” To this one should merely add that Overbeck evidently resolved early on to stand by the young philosopher, and that he never reneged on that vow, becoming more
Fig. 1. C. A. Bernoulli, *Franz Overbeck und Friedrich Nietzsche. Eine Freundschaft* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1908). Band 2. Frontispiece and title page. Beinecke Library.
protective of and devoted to Nietzsche even as they diverged more and more philosophically and temperamentally. Overbeck himself summed up the relationship: “Our friendship was without any shadows.” The shadows, as we shall see, fell posthumously.

Overbeck and Nietzsche met in Basel in 1869. Nietzsche had arrived in the spring to assume the chair of classical philology at the University of Basel, at the unheard-of age of twenty-four, without even having completed his dissertation. He took up temporary lodgings before finally settling in at No. 45 Schützgraben, hear the Spalentor. Overbeck, seven years Nietzsche’s senior, arrived some months later from Jena to fill the chair in critical theology, a purely academic post, Overbeck having long since lost his own faith. Upon arriving in Basel, Overbeck, too, found lodgings at No. 45, and the two young scholars remained housemates as well as colleagues, sharing room and board until Nietzsche’s premature retirement due to ill health in 1879.

Nietzsche and Overbeck could scarcely have had more different backgrounds. Nietzsche was the son of a small-town Lutheran pastor—“The Lutheran pastor!” he famously quipped, with only slight exaggeration, “is the grandfather of German philosophy”—but enjoyed a rigorous education in classical, and “classical” German, literature and languages at Schulpforta, followed by the universities of Bonn and Leipzig. The more cosmopolitan Overbeck was born in St Petersburg, his mother French, his father a German businessman naturalized British. His first languages were French, Russian, and English, and he only learned German as an eleven-year-old student when his family moved to Dresden.

This singular friendship of twenty years is best traced through their extensive correspondence, which affords rare insight into Nietzsche’s personality, as opposed to the literary persona presented in his books. Despite Nietzsche’s current vogue in this country and the voluminous English literature devoted to him, this valuable correspondence has never been translated. Yet it probably sheds more light on Nietzsche than most of the literature and is, more importantly, a richly moving human document.

A few excerpts from this correspondence may suggest the importance of Overbeck in the philosopher’s wayward life, spent, after his retirement, in perpetual pilgrimage between Sils Maria in the Swiss Alps, and a series of seasonal pensioni in Nice, Genoa, and Turin.

Approaching his thirtieth birthday, Nietzsche writes to his friend of five years: “I think of you frequently: Whoever turns thirty counts
up his treasures and asks himself: Will this get me through life? Yes, it would seem so” (end of September 1874). Five years later, Nietzsche, his health and hopes declining, again registers his birthday by expressing his debt to Overbeck:

Dear, dear friend, I receive birthday wishes from you—the giver of so many good gifts—differently than from others. This entire birthday I have thought of you and yours, and tried to reckon the sum of favors you have showered me over this past year, in media vita as the pious have it. “At the midnights on the road of my life I found myself embraced by . . . good Overbeck.” Otherwise I should perhaps have chosen another companion—Mors. (22 October 1879)

This sense of devotion against a backdrop of despair increasingly dominates Nietzsche’s portion of the correspondence. In late 1881, he writes:

My dear friend, what is this our life? A skiff that swims in the sea, about which one can only say with certainty that one day it will capsize. Now we are two good old skiffs who have faithfully stuck together, and your hand was always there to prevent me from “capsizing.” So we wish to continue our journey for a long, long time, for each other’s sake! We would miss each other so much. Just enough smooth seas and good winds and above all sunshine—which I wish for myself I wish for you, too, sad that my gratitude can only express itself in such wishes and that it has no power over wind and weather! (14 November 1881)

Approaching his fortieth birthday, Nietzsche, by now nearly blind and subject to racking pain much of the time, begins to sound a still more somber note:

Sometimes I sink into deep, deep melancholy, I scarcely could say why. It may be that deep down I have always somehow believed that by this point in my life I would no longer be alone . . . thoughts with which I have comforted myself through periods of cruelest isolation. Meanwhile it has transpired otherwise . . . I think of you and your dear wife with a grateful heart. (July 1884)

Nietzsche’s piercing sense of growing isolation is balanced only by an abiding appreciation of Overbeck’s loyalty.

Everything is now in my hands, fortunately, and your birthday wishes even now in my heart. Yours were the only birthday wishes committed to paper that I received this time—I have pondered a long time about this fact of a forty-one-year-old life. Oh, one becomes so grateful for friendship, my dear old friend. (17 October 1885)

And again, two years later:

Dear friend, on your birthday I have already sent a couple of small gifts. The “Hymn to Life” . . . [and] above all the expression of my admiration
and gratitude for the steadfast faithfulness you have shown me in the hardest and most incomprehensible period of my life . . . I was already alone as a child. I am still so, in my forty-fourth year. (12 November 1887)

In early January 1889 Nietzsche collapsed, insane, in the streets of Turin, flinging his arms around a carriage horse that was being flogged by a coachman. In the following days, he fired off a series of palpably mad but strangely moving letters and postcards to erstwhile friends and colleagues, literary figures, and even heads of state. On 7 January, the Overbecks received a postcard with the message:

To Dear Friend Overbeck and Wife. Though you have so far shown little faith in my solvency, yet I hope to prove that I am someone who pays his debts, for example to you . . . I have just had all antisemites shot. Dionysus.
(Undated, but 5 January 1889)

The final phrase in this postcard to the Overbecks was omitted when the correspondence was published in 1916. This was not the first instance of censorship in the publication of Nietzscheana.

Like Nietzsche, Overbeck repaid his debts. When he received Nietzsche’s card, Overbeck immediately brought it to a Basel psychiatrist, Wille, along with a longer and equally alarming letter received by Jacob Burckhardt. Wille strongly advised Overbeck to retrieve his friend and deliver him to his clinic in Basel. Overbeck left promptly for Turin and managed with considerable difficulty to smuggle his friend across the border back to Switzerland, sparing Nietzsche both the scandal and the risk of prosecution his wild behavior in Turin might have occasioned. Nietzsche’s collapse, correctly identified by the psychiatrist as symptomatic of paralysis progressiva, coincided tragically with his emergence, at long last, from obscurity—too late for him to appreciate or even take cognizance of his sudden fame.  

At the time of his collapse, Nietzsche’s surviving manuscripts, which ranged from complete drafts of unpublished books, to the miscellaneous notebooks Nietzsche carried with him on his walks, to piles of paper expressly intended for destruction, were scattered between Turin, Genoa, and Sils Maria. Initially, Overbeck assumed responsibility for rescuing and preserving his friend’s Nachlaß, along with Nietzsche’s sometime amanuensis and self-proclaimed disciple, Peter Gast, and his publisher, C. G. Naumann. In a letter to Gast of 23 February 1889, Overbeck expressed his profound concern that Nietzsche’s literary estate remain in their hands and, by clear implication, that it not fall into the hands of Nietzsche’s sister, Elisabeth.
Elisabeth Nietzsche (1846–1935) had married Bernard Förster, a notorious demagogue who had founded an “Aryan” colony, “Nueva Germania,” in Paraguay along with his wife and a phalanx of pioneers. Nietzsche loathed his brother-in-law and all he stood for, and ultimately felt compelled to repudiate his sister, too, who had come to represent in his mind everything he abhorred about the nascent German Reich. After her husband’s suicide in June 1889, prompted by a scandal in the colony, Elisabeth, destitute, returned to Germany. Ever the opportunist, she quickly hitched her own fortunes to Nietzsche’s rising literary star. By late 1893 she had peremptorily dismissed Peter Gast, who was engaged with producing a collected edition of Nietzsche’s published works and, in February 1894, founded the Nietzsche Archive in the family home in Naumburg, with the ghostly shadow of her insane brother as the main attraction. By December 1895 she had become Nietzsche’s official guardian and owner of the copyright to his works. In the summer of 1896 she seized an opportunity to relocate the Archive to Weimar, the Mecca of classical German literary culture, hoping to add Nietzsche’s name to the pantheon of German cultural heroes that prominently included Goethe and Schiller.

Nietzsche took eleven years to die. Elisabeth meanwhile performed her role as self-proclaimed guardian of the Nietzsche legacy with zeal. Upon her brother’s death in 1900, she promptly set about composing a definitive, authorized biography of the philosopher, and even managed to re-enlist the deeply ambivalent but ultimately indispensable Peter Gast to edit a new collected edition of Nietzsche’s works under her editorial guidance. Simultaneously, she began to circulate the accusation that Overbeck had mismanaged Nietzsche’s papers and even negligently lost precious manuscripts. Overbeck meanwhile observed that he was in the possession of a comprehensive correspondence which would refute her biography point by point and would definitively discredit Elisabeth’s claim to represent her brother’s philosophy. Out of this skirmish there emerged a standing feud between “Basel” (the Overbecks and their friends and colleagues, outraged by Elisabeth’s slanders) and “Weimar” (Nietzsche’s sister and the Nietzsche Archive).12

Overbeck died in 1905, hounded to his deathbed by Elisabeth. In his will, he left his letters from Nietzsche to the University of Basel with the stipulation that they be published by Bernoulli. Elisabeth countered with a lawsuit against Bernoulli and the prospective publisher, Diederichs, asserting copyright to her brother’s letters as part
of his literary estate. In early 1908, the court in Jena ruled in Elisabeth’s favor, prohibiting any quotation from personal letters without the author’s permission. Simultaneously, Peter Gast filed suit to block publication of volume two of Bernoulli’s biographical study of Overbeck and Nietzsche. This suit, too, was encouraged by Elisabeth, but mostly reflects Gast’s understandable alarm at the prospect of Bernoulli reproducing in extenso Gast’s own letters to Overbeck, in which his opinion of the philosopher’s sister was registered unambiguously and, now that he was in Elisabeth’s employ, embarrassingly. For this would have revived “the memory of the lively critic of Elisabeth and her Archive who had in a quarter century of correspondence with Overbeck shown some of his most endearing human traits.”

Bernoulli’s study of Overbeck and Nietzsche was conceived above all as a worthy monument to and defense of Overbeck. It evolved in conscious opposition to the publications program of the Nietzsche Archive, which distinguished itself by its programmatic misrepresentation of biographical facts and willful falsification of documents.

Thirty-two passages in the second volume of Bernoulli’s book were ultimately suppressed as a result of the court decision rendered in Jena on 27 May 1908. The Beinecke copy of Bernoulli’s book seems to be representative of the majority of copies with respect to the form the censorship assumed. The suppressed passages, which range from a single word to more than ten pages (for example, pp. 308–17, 339–48), have been blacked out with printer’s ink, or “bisked” (fig. 2). By contrast, in some copies, including the copy at Sterling Library, the passages in question are omitted entirely and replaced in each instance by a publisher’s note to the reader explaining that “The text is abridged here as a result of the judgment of the Jena court, 27 May 1908” (Infoge des Jenaer Gerichtsurteils vom 27. Mai 1908 ist hier der Text gekürzt worden) (fig. 3). Whereas Beinecke’s copy was evidently censored after being printed but before publication, Sterling’s copy confirms that, in conformity with the court’s mandate, the printer duly interrupted his print run, reset his type to omit the contested passages, and inserted an explanatory note before proceeding.

There are two instances in which the blacked-out copies, too, feature the publisher’s note in lieu of the original text. This occurs on pages 308 and 330 (fig. 4). As noted, these pages mark the points at which the two most extensive suppressions occur. Collation of the pages in question reveals that at these points the publisher, confronted with the need to knit together a readable text bridging the


Sie erinnern sich an die Verkündigung der Thatsachen der in dieser Zeit verstorbenen Männer der Schöpfung? Sie erinnern sich an die Verkündigung der Thatsachen der in dieser Zeit verstorbenen Männer der Schöpfung?

Ein Brief, den ich an Sie geschrieben habe, traf mich um die Verkündigung der Thatsachen der in dieser Zeit verstorbenen Männer der Schöpfung.

Fig. 3. Bernoulli, p. 380-81. Sterling Library.
hauptete, es müsse ein Frauenzimmer sein; welcher (nicht in
seinem letzter Absicht) ausbot, er fände aus einer Familie, in
welcher der Wahn über berufene Generationen zu üben sei, und
allein, an dem ersten als zum Teil Verkrustet, über die Bedeutung
seiner Seele und ihrer Einstellung auf ihn, und das alles
solle aus einer Einstellung einer Familie beruhen, welche aus nächs-
ster Nähe die Geschmächer hatte auszudeuten geben, auch nur ein
geringer Teil dessen sei, was die Quelle so gut geleistet habe
und sie jetzt noch beliebt bleiben müsse." — Durch Frau Major
Mietzsch erfuhr Overbeck von weiteren Ankängern, die für
Mietzsches Bekanntwerden etwas zu tun geschehen, so des Priv-
atschreiters F. Lauterbach, der in Leipzig Mietzsches Verbreiten
tat und sich bei seinen Briefen in Hannover mit Mietzsch selbst
über diese Absicht unterhielt — von der dän-
ischen Ausgabe der zwei Teile Zarauskara und von einer zweiten
Ausgabe von "Jeweil von Gut und Böse" — von der in Aus-
sehen gezeigten Propaganda eines französischen Louis de Heffen,
der sich anbot, eine französisch Ausgabe von Mietzsches Werken
t zu besorgen.

Infolge des jüngsten Gerichtsurteils vom
27. Mai 1808 ist hier die Darstellung
um die Sitten 341—348 gehört worden.

Am Ende des Jahres 1809 trat Mietzsches Schwerter
aus Paraguay zu mehr als einjährige Re-
suche in Europa ein. Ihr Widerschein mit dem
Bruder fiel bereits in eine Zeit, da dessen Krätze
vorsiehbar wurde; aus der verhältnismäßig
guten Kälte des Jahres der ersten sechs Jahre hat sich aber
doch nicht zu Geschäft kommen. Längstens ist auf Entlastung in erster
Zeit der Bedeutung der durch die fünfschönen Zellen der großen, in
Verwirrung geratenen Kolonialrechts und Ämter des yon
359

Fig. 4. Bernoulli, p. 359. Beinecke Library.
suppressed portions, simply had the printer remove the entire gathering in copies already printed and reset his type and then provided the explanatory note that he henceforth supplied throughout all subsequent copies of volume two.¹⁵

Two generations of Nietzsche scholars toiled fruitlessly, employing special lighting, infrared technology, and chemicals, in a futile effort to decipher the suppressed passages in Bernoulli’s important documentary study. Only in 1977 did a sole, uncensored copy of the book surface in the Universitätsbibliothek in Jena. The suppressed passages were published immediately by the late Mazzino Montinari,¹⁶ dean of modern Nietzsche scholars and editor-in-chief of the now-standard critical edition of Nietzsche’s collected works.¹⁷ This discovery sheds light on a whole range of issues concerning Nietzsche’s life and legacy, and especially on the politics of censorship in the Nietzsche Archive.

Thanks to Montinari’s discovery, we can now confirm that most of the censored passages in Bernoulli’s second volume do indeed involve Gast’s self-incriminating letters. For example, on pages 365f., Bernoulli quoted a letter from Gast to Overbeck of 14 April 1898:

Nietzsche’s poems have just been sent to me by Frau Dr Förster. I almost laughed over the dedication to “Herr Peter Gast with heartfelt greetings from the editor.” Naumann [Nietzsche’s publisher] is once again being sued by this angelic lady. She only knows how to distress people, to slander them, and to condemn them in the most obviously unfair way.

Similarly, Bernoulli quoted (p. 392) Gast’s remark about his abrupt dismissal as editor of Nietzsche’s collected works: “I am glad and unspeakably thankful that I was evicted in time” from the Nietzsche Archive.

Clearly, Gast had ample reason for not wishing Elisabeth to know his real sentiments about her and the Archive. As we now know, he had expressed this sentiment as soon as she returned to Germany from the “colony” in Paraguay:

An event has occurred that must distress me and all things Nietzschean: Frau Dr Förster has returned from Paraguay! There were a couple of bad days in which I would gladly have resigned my editorship. But after reflecting more calmly, I said to myself that I should not confound Frau Dr Förster with Friedrich Nietzsche! (letter of 19 September 1893, quoted in Bernoulli, p. 359f.)

Two months later, Gast wrote: “In short, she has no adequate idea who her brother is and what he intends” (Gast’s italics).
As mentioned above, two particularly long passages in Bernoulli’s second volume were censored. The ten pages following page 308 dealt principally with two subjects: irrationalist Julius Langbehn’s astonishing claim that he could cure the ailing philosopher if given complete control of the patient (“Langbehn,” Gast enthused in a letter to Overbeck dated 16 February 1890, “is a great man”); and Nietzsche’s physical and mental state immediately after his collapse. Bernoulli’s original text has been cobbled together to read smoothly around these extensive excisions.

The other instance of extensive suppression occurs at pages 339–48. The sensitive subjects dealt with in these pages included: Nietzsche’s father’s illness and the possible genetic basis of his own; Nietzsche’s pathetic state after his collapse; his sister’s exclusive preoccupation with her own affairs during this crucial time; Gast’s anger at her suppression of the fourth and (to Elisabeth) dangerously blasphemous part of Also Sprach Zarathustra; Gast’s crucial role as Nietzsche’s editor; and Overbeck’s deep personal loyalty to Nietzsche and his singular role in preserving the philosopher’s scattered manuscripts. In this instance, the censorship went beyond simply suppressing objectionable texts. It seems not to have been noticed that whole passages have been rewritten, not simply to knit together a readable account around the suppressed passages, but so as to alter fundamentally the meaning of the original text. Thus the published text omits Bernoulli’s observation that Gast, in his editorial work, turned to Overbeck for information about Nietzsche’s early life and that he was largely responsible for producing a series of new editions of Nietzsche’s works that sold like hotcakes. Bernoulli is made to say instead: “It is therefore hardly right to say that Peter Gast single-handedly brought a complete edition into existence. Nietzsche was selling well; the demand had to be satisfied.” Similarly, where Bernoulli compliments Gast on his “brilliant prefaces” to his new editions of Nietzsche’s books—*seine geistreichen Vorreden*—the published text simply records laconically the fact that Gast contributed prefaces to them.

If Nietzsche’s legacy in German history was arguably baleful, it is in no small part due to the way in which his works and thought were misappropriated and misrepresented by his sister and the Nietzsche Archive. It is therefore tempting to speculate how events might have been different had Bernoulli succeeded in exposing Elisabeth’s pretensions and falsifications early on. Nietzsche himself liked to quote the adage, *Mundus vult decipi*—the world wants to be deceived.
Gast thought so, too. In yet another censored passage of Bernoulli’s book (p. 360), the author quotes a letter from Gast dated 22 March 1899: “A public debate with Frau Dr Förster would only be tempting if the opponent were corrigible. . . . Let us not disturb her phantas-magoria! Decipiatur mundus. . . .” Bernoulli was not resigned to the inevitability of such self-deception, nor was Overbeck. Summing up his reaction to the third and final volume of Elisabeth’s biography of her brother, he wrote:

One often hears—and with good reason—“mundus vult decipi.” Yet rarely has the reading public been more deceived than in this book. She will be praised as a saint among sisters. That will change. (Bernoulli, p. 431f.)

It did change, but despite the efforts of Overbeck and Bernoulli, the change took a half century to occur.


3. The friendship has recently been studied by Carles Vergeer, “Friedrich Nietzsche en Franz Overbeck III,” Maatschapblad 28:1 (January 1989), 32-54. As Vergeer observes, Bernoulli’s two volumes remain the indispensable study of the two men’s friendship—and an indispensable biographical source for Nietzsche students in general (“Dat boek is zonder meer onmisbaar voor elke werkelijke Nietzsche studie: het is geen beschouwing over maar een bron.” p. 42).


5. R. Oehler and C. A. Bernoulli, eds., Friedrich Nietzsche’s Briefwechsel mit Franz Overbeck (Leipzig: Insel, 1966). Nietzsche’s best translator, Walter Kaufmann, observed twenty years ago that “it would make good sense to reissue—and even to translate—this correspondence, complete, also in paperback. It would throw more light on Nietzsche than any of the several editions of selected letters that have been published in English” (The Future of the Humanities [New York: Readers Digest Press, 1957], p. 116). This is true even of the best of these selections, Selected Letters of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. and transl. by Christopher Middleton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).
6. Translations are the author's.

7. Like other passages omitted from this published correspondence, this one was included in later editions of Nietzsche's works, and appears in Middleton's edition of the Selected Letters (above).


12. This feud can be followed blow by blow in Krummel, Nietzsche und der deutsche Geist. One of the most judicious appraisals of the dispute was that of Charles Andler (1909; Krummel, no. 830), who later wrote a comprehensive and still useful 6-volume study of Nietzsche, sa vie et sa pensée (Paris: Bossard, 1920-31; reprinted, 1958).


15. The writer owns a copy of Bernoulli's book that agrees in all respects with the Beinecke copy.


18. "Nietzsche wurde stark gekauft," Bernoulli's original text read: "Nietzsche wurde stark gelesen"—Nietzsche was now being read widely.